

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 BREENDA HILL, et al.,
9 Plaintiffs,
10 v.
11 KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN,
12 INC., et al.,
13 Defendants.

14
15
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18 San Francisco Division

19 Case No. 10-cv-02833-LB

20 **ORDER**

21 Re: ECF No. 253

22 The court previously entered an order describing the process to resolve the fees dispute. (*See*
23 Order, ECF No. 236.¹) It then issued an order describing the additional parameters for the motion
24 (such as supporting declarations) and setting January 7, 2016, as the last day for Mr. Friedman to
25 file his motion. (See ECF No. 249.) The court also defined a strategy for raising scheduling
disputes, including a joint submission with a chart to raise differences about schedules. (*See id.*).
Mr. Friedman then filed an administrative motion to extend the time to file his brief until February
4, 2016. (*See* ECF No. 253.) In quick order, the plaintiffs opposed it, Mr. Friedman replied, and
the plaintiffs replied. (*See* ECF Nos. 254, 256, 257.) The court now orders the following.

26 First, for good cause, it grants Mr. Friedman's motion, which extends the time period to file

27
28 ¹ Citations are to the Electronic Case File ("ECF"); pin cites are to the ECF-generated page
numbers at the tops of the documents.
ORDER (No.10-cv-02833-LB)

1 the brief until February 4, 2016. This triggers the following schedule under the local rules: the
2 opposition is due February 18, 2016, the reply is due February 25, 2016, and the hearing will be
3 March 10, 2016, at 9:30 a.m. The court's prior reference to the "holidays" was meant to shield the
4 plaintiffs' schedule, not be a sword to oppose any continuance, no matter what the ground.

5 Second, the court of course will consider any "ancillary issues" that the parties raise. (*See* Mr.
6 Friedman's Administrative Motion, ECF No. 23 at 4-5). That said, it considered its approach
7 thoroughly in the prior orders, and the parties should not expect any deviation from it.

8 Third, the court reiterates its prior order at ECF No. 249 that any requests to change the
9 schedule must be joint. The court also refines its process for raising scheduling disputes as
10 follows. Before filing a request, the parties must meet and confer at least by telephone if other
11 means do not resolve the dispute. The format for the joint submission is as follows. The title must
12 be "Joint Submission Re Schedule Dispute" (or the equivalent), and the first line must contain an
13 attestation that the parties complied with the meet-and-confer process. The paragraphs that follow
14 must be as follows: 1) the requesting party's reason for a change in no more than 250 words; 2)
15 the opposing party's opposition in no more than 250 words; 3) the requesting party's reply to the
16 opposition in no more than 100 words; 4) the chart in ECF No. 249; and 5) the parties' signatures
17 followed by a proposed order in the form of, "The court imposes the schedule in the chart. It is so
18 ordered." If the court wants a more detailed explanation, it will ask for it. Also, if the parties really
19 cannot navigate filing a joint request, the requesting party may prepare the draft joint request and
20 email it to the opposing party. Within two business days, the opposing party must insert its section
21 and email it back. Within one business day, the requesting party will e-file the request.

22 Finally, the filings at ECF Nos. 253, 254, 256, and 257 created unnecessary work, caused
23 delay, violated the court's order at ECF No. 249, and are not consistent with the district court's
24 civility guidelines and the undersigned's own approach to resolving disputes. *See*
25 http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/professional_conduct_guidelines. The parties can do better.

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

27 Dated:



28 LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge